2 9 MAR 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Secretary, CIA Management Committee

SUBJECT : DDI Comment on Report of IG Survey of OER

- 1. The DDI comment on the report of the IG survey of OER is completely responsive, both in terms of the general discussion of questions that did not result in formal recommendations and in the response to the two formal proposals that were made.
- 2. The new practice of preparing typescript reports of research, without subjecting the paper to the detailed review procedure for publication, should materially reduce the workload on the production machinery of the office. There is nothing wrong in CER doing research for its own reference writing its own reference library in a sense. Many complex economic problems take considerable time to research, and if certain work has been done in anticipation of requirements, it will strengthen the responsiveness of the office under the tighter deadlines that characterize much of the work that OER now does for its customers.
- 3. We note particularly the response to Recommendation No. 2. We realize the difficulty in developing reliable and useful evaluations from readers of the Agency's intelligence production. Our suggestion of an organized program of selective elicitation from consumers derived, in part, from the existence of OER's network of contacts in the community. The stated purpose of using this resource for this purpose is what we had in mind.

(Signed) William V. Broe William V. Broe Inspector General

IG/OFR

ADMINISTRATE AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT

Approved For Rease 2001/08/14 : CIA-RDP80B010864

0900050001-8 DDI-<u>340</u>-73

26 MAR 1973

73-281/5

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Executive Secretary

CIA Management Committee

SUBJECT

IG Survey of OER

1. I have reviewed the IG Survey of OER and am, quite naturally, very pleased by such a favorable report. The Survey team did a very thorough job in reviewing OER's operations. Their report is lucid, well written and shows a good understanding of what OER is all about and how it operates. The Survey's recommendations—both formal and informal—are well taken and focus on issues about which both the Director, OER, and I are aware and are taking corrective action. Before commenting on the Survey's formal recommendations, I would like to make some general comments on points raised by the IG team.

- 2. The IG Survey quite rightly made a strong point of the poor physical working conditions in OER. The crowding of analysts and the paucity of working space are regrettable and have a perverse effect on morale and the efficiency of operations. As you well know, this regrettable condition is not unique to OER and the space problem remains a constant irritant among our employees. In my initial sessions with Mr. Schlesinger, I identified the space situation as one of our principal problems. As soon as the IG Survey on space is completed, I would hope that it will become a top priority matter for the Management Committee to consider and to take effective action upon.
- 3. The review process in OER was also a problem on which the IG Survey team focused. I agree that the review process had been overly encumbered by unnecessary review layers and, as such, a subject of legitimate complaint by the

IG/ORR

Classified by 009606

Exempt from general declassification schedule of S. O. 1972, exemption collegary:

50.00 (D. 1972), exemption collegary:

10.00 (D. 1972) (et du erus or mure)

analysts. I do not believe that the review process has had a double standard. The high priority project obviously passes through the system much more quickly. This is not only because of externally imposed deadlines, but also because the analysts assigned to such projects are our most responsive, substantively skilled and able writers. Given the rapid pace of OER daily activities, I cannot subscribe to the view that routine papers are being over-edited or over-reviewed simply because the reviewer has time on his hands. I would suspect that the amount of review and editing required for a given report is proportionate to the extent to which the draft is deficient in research or analysis.

- 4. In any event I believe that recent measures will eliminate most of the analysts' complaints about the review process. OER's recent reorganization has reduced the number of organizational levels through which a draft must pass. In addition, the Director, OER, has recently initiated a new system of monthly and quarterly planning of OER production designed to ensure, among other things, that both analyst and supervisor understand and agree on the purpose and scope of each project. These procedures have already reduced markedly the number of projects that have to be substantially redone during the later stages of the review process.
- 5. Furthermore, in response to the DCI's instruction to reduce the number of publications, I have recently formulated new guidelines for the production of finished intelligence in the Intelligence Directorate. These guidelines will mean that a substantial part of OER production will be produced in typescript form and disseminated upon request only. Such projects obviously will require far less editing and review than those projects which must meet the higher standards required for official Agency publications. By carefully delineating the types of projects that will not be published and by tailoring our product to specific audiences and consumers, it is clear to me that it would not be practical to adopt a basic and uniform review standard, as suggested in the Survey.

in order to determine the degree to which they are satisfied with present approaches to preparation of reports, as a basis for modifying present practice if so indicated."

Comment

This recommendation touches on a problem which is pertinent to the entire array of DDI production. It is an integral part of the Agency's approach to "management by objective" and the means by which we can measure the achievement of our objectives. We are in the process of trying to devise a meaningful method of evaluating our product. Such evaluation is particularly difficult in an area where quantitative measurements are desired for output that must be measured essentially in qualitative terms.

Informal systems of feedback from our customers have so far not been reliable means of evaluating OER's, or any other office's product. Customer responses become largely pro forma or the customer is reluctant to give a negative response for fear that the tap will be turned off. OER has tried to cope with this situation by mounting a major effort to determine our customers' needs and, in concert with the customer, to decide on the best production vehicle to meet these needs. Our new production guidelines have chosen the Intelligence Brief, a highly personalized and tailored document, as a means of being most responsive to the policy makers' needs.

OER has also set up a wide network of contacts with staff officers in the NSC, Treasury, the CIEP and the entire economic community. Key OER personnel have been designated as the principal contact points for specified policy level customers and their immediate staff officers. I am hopeful that as these contacts become more frequent that we will have considerable success in eliciting informed reactions to and evaluations of the OER product.

EDWARD W. PROCTOR
Deputy Director for Intelligence

cc: Inspector General